

placing said workpieces on said first station with said robot, wherein said robot includes at least one workpiece gripping device for retrieving and holding said workpieces which includes a dry end-effector for gripping dry workpieces and a wet end-effector for gripping wet workpieces.

26 (NEW). A method as claimed in claim 25, wherein said workpieces are retrieved from a tilted cassette in said first station and transferred with said dry end-effector to an index table in said second station.

27 (NEW). A method as claimed in claim 26, wherein said third station comprises a rinsing station and a drying station, and comprising the additional step of transferring said workpieces from said rinsing station to said drying station with said wet end-effector.

28 (NEW). A method as claimed in claim 27, wherein said workpieces are retrieved from said drying station with said dry end-effector and transferred to said cassette.

29 (NEW). A method as claimed in claim 28, wherein said robot has six axes to permit movement of said end-effectors among said tilted cassette, said index table, said rinsing station, and said drying station.

30 (NEW). A wafer handling system as claimed in claim 20, wherein said dry wafer gripping device is a dry end-effector and said wet wafer gripping device is a wet end-effector.

31 (NEW). A wafer handling system as claimed in claim 30, wherein said dry end-effector and said wet end-effector are oriented substantially orthogonal to each other.

*Adda* REMARKS

In the January 18, 2001 Office Action, the Examiner first renumbered Applicants' claims 108-119, 124 and 125 as claims 12-24 under Rule 126. Applicants acknowledge and thank the Examiner for this correct renumbering of the claims. In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 12-14, objected to claims 15-22, and allowed claims 23 and 24. This Response cancels claims 12-19 and 21-22, without prejudice or disclaimer, and adds new claims 25-31 for consideration.

On page 3 of his Office Action, the Examiner stated that claims 15-22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In order to